

May 16, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01601R000300340036-6

ment intended as a response to the recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, a group of prominent educators have noted their conviction that the conventional family is abandoning its role in moral education and that the educator is prepared to fulfill this function as the child is exposed to ever earlier educational direction. Dr. Caldwell and her associates go even further, and echo Bronfenbrenner's conclusions in the ideological orientation of Soviet daycare. In the Caldwell paper previously mentioned there is a most exceptional judgment. The authors are disarming in first noting "When we talk about 'group care for infants,' it is easy to have it sound, as though we are proposing something radically deviant for the children."

If they do not believe that their next idea is not "radically deviant," I would surely like to know what would qualify for that label. That quotation continues:

"In the Western world of today with its tleky-tacky houses, Dick and Jane and mother and dad raders, and our carefully nurtured concern for territoriality and for 'mine' and 'yours,' it is easy to forget that historically speaking and right up until recent times, 'group care' was the species pattern for infants and children of Homo Sapiens."

Two sentences later they conclude, rhapsodically, that in extended family settings that day care approximates, there is never a question about who belongs to whom. Bronfenbrenner, it should be added, has probably exacerbated concerns such as those of Senator Buckley by his conclusions that day care is a deliberate Soviet vehicle for bypassing the family to educate the new Communist Man.

In my observations of the functioning of Communist systems, I could never find substance to the idea that group day care could ever be effective in inculcating ideological views. The problems of day-to-day management in the best of centers give rise to exhausted staff and a constant struggle to maintain the system. I am less than troubled by those who would see day care as a vehicle for purposeful modification of the family and our social system. But I am most concerned that the conditions of group care may lead to inhibitions in independent functioning as an inevitable consequence of early conditioning. If social disaster is to come insidiously through massive programs in childhood experiments, then it will come, I am convinced, via depersonalization, subtle developmental failures in personality structure, and in marginal intellectual capabilities.

I will conclude my comments with one brief vignette. Our interpreter in Leningrad, Mr. Boris Lavitman, was a rather remarkable young man who happened fortuitously to be the director of the city's staff of professional interpreters. Mr. Lavitman courteously translated, time and again, a range of sociocultural questions that, as he later noted, struck him as odd because they appeared so distant from the subject of daycare. Over vodka on a very cold day, when we were concluding our study with a lunch, Mr. Lavitman confided that he had been talking with his wife (who suffered, incidentally, from a severe claustrophobia) about the long range consequences of daycare that I was concerned with. He and his wife had reviewed the number of married couples they knew personally, and the total was something like 50. Both Mr. Lavitman and his wife had each been married three times and they had two children. Of the fifty couples they knew, only one or two had not been married three times—and they estimated that the average number of children per couple was about one per family. As survivors of the siege of Leningrad, both of these adults had been reared in group daycare. They speculated, as I now do: is there a relationship between

early daycare and the adults subsequent incapacity for family intimacy and constancy?

Recommendations

I cannot imagine that you would be prepared to revise existing bills on the basis of any one person's criticisms. There are a number of eminent psychiatrists and psychoanalysts both here and abroad who have twenty to forty more years of experience than I. Of those who are particularly distinguished in research on child development and psychopathology, I would recommend the following for your consideration:

Dr. Rene Spitz, the University of Colorado.
Dr. Margaret Mahler, Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Dr. Humberto Nagera, the University of Michigan.

Dr. Sally Provence, Yale University.
There are many distinguished psychoanalysts resident here in Washington. If your Committee aides should wish to confirm the clinical views of the dangers of daycare for the very young, I would be pleased to provide a distinguished local roster.

I would repeat my conviction that effective daycare is urgently needed today—as a remedial program that with all its limitations, is undoubtedly better than the neglect of our most disadvantaged children. But, I would also urge as strongly as possible, that daycare should be initially restricted to demonstration projects so that you, and the new profession of caretakers that follow may have time to work out both programs and psychiatric evaluations of their effects. This should be a basic precondition to the extension of daycare on any massive basis. While the types of psychopathology I have referred to may not be manifest until school age or later years, it is clearly possible to at least verify in the immediate future, the direct effect on health, developmental quotients, and socialization. Such research control, it is obvious, needs to be centralized in an authority independent of the centers themselves.

My task this morning has not been comfortable for me. I fully appreciate that your task in designing legislative programs is arduous, requiring a judicious weighing of alternatives and an assumption of responsibility that your critics are spared.

ANDERSON AND KGB INSERTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Jack Anderson's outstanding exposé on "Brainwashing With Microwaves" should refocus our attention on the constant danger to freedom which continues in the midst of efforts for East-West detente. The article follows:

BRAINWASHING WITH MICROWAVES

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—Hidden in the Central Intelligence Agency's most secret files is an account of a possible Soviet attempt to "brainwash" our embassy personnel in Moscow with mysterious microwaves.

The fantastic details are contained in a file marked "Operation Pandora," which describes how the Russians bombarded our embassy with eerie, low-radiation impulses. Their secret intent, it was suspected, may have been to alter the personalities of our diplomats.

The bizarre story began in 1945 when a Russian presented Averell Harriman, then our ambassador, with a handsome carved Great Seal of the United States. Harriman proudly hung it in the embassy.

The seal contained a tiny electronic eaves-

dropping device, which in 1952, when it was detected. From this shocking discovery came urgent orders that all embassies must be periodically checked for electronic signals.

In the 1960s, U.S. security men discovered the strange microwave impulses, some steady, some pulsating, directed into our Moscow embassy from a neighboring building.

The CIA quickly learned that Russian medical literature suggested microwaves can cause nervous tension, irritability, even disorders. They speculated that the Russians were trying to drive American diplomats stir-crazy with the waves.

Neither the CIA nor the State Department had the facilities to test the effects of the silent rays on human beings. At the Pentagon, however, the super-secret Advanced Research Project Agency had worked on electronic sensors and other weird projects.

The agency quietly began a study, under the direction of Richard Cesaro, into the effects of microwaves on people. Cesaro gave the project the code name, "Operation Pandora," and called in a physician, Dr. Herb Polack, and two crack military scientists, Dr. Joseph Sharp of Walter Reed Army Hospital, and engineer-microwave expert Mark Grove of the Air Force.

Sharp and Grove, supplied with the microwave data monitored in the embassy, duplicated the embassy environment, using monkeys for diplomats.

The monkeys actually were trained to perform tasks and then were rewarded with food, much as embassy employees might be rewarded with a dry martini at the end of the day.

The monkeys were studied night and day for months at Walter Reed, while a collateral experiment was also conducted on rabbits by consultant Dr. Milton Zaret in his own laboratory.

In the embassy in Moscow, meanwhile, no one except the highest diplomats and security men were aware of the secret microwave drama.

By 1967, the scientists felt they had watched the monkeys long enough for a tentative reading. Some felt there were signs of "aberrant behavior" caused by microwaves, but the majority disagreed. Only the rabbits showed clear changes—in their heart rate—which Zaret attributed to heat from the rays.

The disagreements on 'psychological' changes were sent to a top-secret reviewing board, which also could reach no absolute conclusion that the rays affected the monkeys' minds.

Nevertheless, the suspicion lingered, and the White House decided that even if the microwaves were not "brainwashing" embassy people, they should be halted. It was also suspected that the waves might be part of some radical new surveillance technique.

At the June, 1967, Glassboro meeting between President Lyndon Johnson and Soviet Premier Alexsei Kosygin, the question of the microwave rays came up. One informant insists Johnson personally asked Kosygin to end the ray bombardment, although other sources say the request was made at a lower level.

By 1968, most of Cesaro's scientists were convinced that the microwaves were not psychologically harmful and the embassy experiments ended in early 1969.

The brilliant work done by the team, however, has now led to important research on the effects of microwaves. So far, tests show high radiation can injure eyes, genital organs and perhaps other parts of the body. But, as yet, there is no conclusive proof that low-level radiation is harmful.

Footnote: We have spoken with Cesaro, Polack, Sharp, Zaret and Grove. All acknowledge they worked on "Operation Pandora," but all refuse to go into details. As Sharp

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01601R000300340036-6